

## **REMARKS**

Claims 8-16, 21-30 and 32 are presently pending. Claims 14-16, 22-24 and 28-30 have been withdrawn from consideration. Claims 8-13, 21, 25-27 and 32 have been rejected.

Claims 8, 13 and 32 have been amended. No claims have been canceled or added herein.

### **I. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 8-13, 21, 25-27 and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0027257 to Kinsman, et al. (“Kinsman”) alone. In particular, the Office Action states, “Kinsman discloses . . . a plurality of solder bumps 20/32 (fig. 1f) . . . and a single support coating 30 (fig. 1f) . . . [that] has been fully cured . . . prior to any reflow of any of said . . . solder bumps.” The Office Action also states, “it would have been obvious . . . to modify the invention of Kinsman with specific ranges for the support coating’s height relative to the bumps.” Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Applicants respectfully submit that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been made for several reasons. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, a given prior art reference must teach or suggest all claim limitations. *See, e.g.*, MPEP § 2143. In addition, there must be a reasonable expectation of success when making a proposed modification to the prior art. *See id.* Furthermore, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the prior art itself or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify a reference. *See id.* Applicants respectfully submit that none of these three requirements are met by the obviousness rejections as set forth in the Office Action. Further details and remarks regarding these contentions are provided in Applicants’ prior Response of December 11, 2006, and these details and remarks are incorporated by reference herein.

Despite the traversal of the pending rejections, Applicants have nevertheless elected to amend claims in this Response in an attempt to expedite prosecution of the pending case. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue the prior claims in a continuing or divisional case at a later time.

Independent claims 8, 13 and 32 have been amended herein. In particular, the limitations “substantially spherical” and “wherein each of said substantially spherical solder bumps is formed from a single homogenous material” have been added to define the solder bumps in claim 8, and the limitation “wherein each of said solder bumps is formed from a single homogenous material” has been added to define the solder bumps in claims 13 and 32. Applicants respectfully submit that Kinsman does not teach or suggest such type of solder bumps formed from a single homogenous material that meet all other limitations of the pending claims, particularly that of a support coating having a height from 20 to 70 percent of the pre-reflow height of the solder bumps. Rather, as stated by the Office Action, “Kinsman discloses . . . a plurality of solder bumps 20/32 (fig. 1f),” where items 20 and 32 of Kinsman are distinct and different items made from different materials and where an encapsulant material rises to 100% of the height of item 20 and 0% of the height of item 32. As such, claims 8, 13, and 32 are patentable over the prior art of record. Because all other pending claims depend from one of claims 8, 13 and 32, all other pending claims are patentable over the prior art of record for at least the same reason.

### **CONCLUSION**

Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in proper form and condition for patentability, and thus request a Notification of Allowance to that effect. Appropriate consideration is being provided herewith for the RCE and extension of time fees. If such consideration is inadvertently omitted, and/or if any other fees are due in connection with this Response or for this application in general, however, then the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0388, referencing Docket No. NSC1P131X3. If there are any questions or issues remaining, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully Submitted,  
BEYER WEAVER, LLP

Date: February 12, 2006

/justinwhite/  
Justin A. White, Esq.  
Reg. No. 48,883

P.O. Box 70250  
Oakland, CA 94612-0250  
(650) 961-8300